

Remarks

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6 are allowed, claims 7-12 are rejected, and claims 13-18 and the specification are objected to. By this paper, claims 7, 13, and 16-17 are amended. Based on the following, consideration of the amended claims, and reconsideration of the remaining rejected claims, are requested.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In particular, the Examiner stated that correction was required because there was "no antecedent basis for 'a preprogrammed algorithm' as claimed in Claims 13 and 16...." By this paper, claims 13, 16 and 17 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In particular, the term "preprogrammed algorithm" has been changed to "stored program". The specification as originally submitted fully supports these claims as amended—see, e.g., paragraph 0023. Applicants submit that each of the pending claims has clear support or antecedent basis in the description of the specification so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be reasonably ascertained by reference to the description, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1).

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner states that in claim 7, there was no teaching for the phrase "command the engine to rotate the motor...." The Examiner correctly discerned Applicants' intent and examined claim 7 on that basis. By this paper, claim 7 is amended to correct the inadvertent transposition of the elements "motor" and "engine". Claim 7 now recites the phrase "command the motor to rotate the engine..." Applicants believe claims 7-12 are now in allowable form.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1-6. The Examiner states that claims 7-12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. As noted above, claim 7 is amended by this paper to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection.

The Examiner objected to claims 13-18 as being dependent upon a specification rejection for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. As discussed above, claims 13, 16 and 17 are amended, and Applicants believe the specification rejection is overcome.

Based on the foregoing, allowance of claims 7-18 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

David Lee Boggs et al.

By Marc F. Malooley
Marc F. Malooley
Reg. No. 50,624
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: July 7, 2004

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351